

REMARKS

Claims 1, 12, 13, 16, 18, and 22-28 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-28 are pending.

Claim 1 has been amended in a manner believed to overcome the Examiner's objection to that Claim.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-9 and 11-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Growney et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,062,460) in view of Solomon (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/023305). The Examiner has rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Growney in view of Solomon and further in view of Meyers (U.S. Pat. No. 7,085,740). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As amended, Claim 1 recites "adjusting a parameter value" wherein "the adjusting is based at least in part" on a buyer "having bid on a particular lot, the act of which bidding on said particular lot has been designated by the seller as triggering a discount." Support for the amendment can be found, without limitation, on page 7 of the Specification.

The Examiner has acknowledged that neither Growney nor Solomon "teach offering a discount on one lot if the buyer bids on another lot." Meyers describes, in column 12, lines 5-7, giving away "points that can be redeemed for either cash rebates or credit toward the next purchase made at that auction house." Giving a party a cash rebate or a credit on a future auction is not the same as "adjusting a parameter value associated with a buyer" based at least in part on that buyer having bid on a lot "designated by the seller as triggering a discount" and then awarding one or more lots to a winning buyer "wherein the bid submitted by the winning buyer has a parameter having a higher parameter value than other parameters calculated from bids of other buyers." Claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Independent Claims 12, 13, and 22 also recite "adjusting a parameter value associated with a buyer in the plurality of buyers, wherein the adjusting is based at least in part on said

buyer having bid on a particular lot, the act of which bidding on said particular lot has been designated by the seller as triggering a discount” and are believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

Claims 14-21 and 23-28 depend from Claims 13 and 22, respectively, and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Robyn Wagner
Registration No. 50,575
V 408-973-2596
F 408-973-2595

Dated: February 29, 2008

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014